



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,181	07/13/2005	Vladimir Pisarski	US03 0013 US2	7816
65913	7590	01/07/2009	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V.			LEIBOVICH, YAIR	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT				
M/S41-SJ			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1109 MCKAY DRIVE			2114	
SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/07/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/542,181	Applicant(s) PISARSKI, VLADIMIR
	Examiner YAIR LEBOVICH	Art Unit 2114

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/14/2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0250) _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent

2. Claims 1-29, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yu (US 2003/0061287 A1).

For claim 1, Yu teaches a method (see title) of affecting a trustworthy-measure associated with a source node (see figure 3C block 138) in a distributed network (see abstract line 2), comprising: receiving an information file from the source node (see abstract line 1: "delivering" as receiving) and a corresponding identifying code that is based on content of the information file when the information file is introduced to the network (see abstract lines 5-6), computing an associated code based on received content of the information file (see abstract line 12); comparing the associated code with the identifying code (see abstract line 12); and transmitting an error report to an administrator node(see figure 3D block 152, and further in [0009] lines 16-17), identifying the source node and the information file (see [0009] lines 16-17), when at least one of the following occur: the associated code does not correspond to the identifying code (see abstract lines 13-14), and the content of the information file is abnormal (see abstract lines 17); thereby facilitating a reduction of the trustworthy-

measure associated with the source node (see figure 3C block 138: "unreliability" as trustworthy measure).

For claim 2, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons above and further teaches repeating the receiving, computing, and comparing steps prior to transmitting the error report (see [0023] lines 13-15).

For claim 3, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons above and further teaches identifying code includes at least one of: a control-sum-code (see [0037] line 9), and a hash-value (see [0003] line 5).

For claim 4, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 1 for the reasons above, and further teaches error report includes the associated code and the identifying code (see figure 1B block 35: block server 12 includes error detecting codes 35, obtained from error reports)

For claim 5, Yu teaches a method of facilitating control of distribution of modified or corrupted files in a distributed network (see figure 3C block 138: "eliminate unreliable" as control), comprising: providing a catalog of available files to nodes of the distributed network (see figure 3C block 130 and [0019] lines 4-5), the catalog identifying each file of the available files and a corresponding source node of each file (see figure 3C block 130 and [0019] lines 4-5), processing an error report from a target node that received a downloaded file from a selected source node (see [0009] line 17: "black listing" as processing), verifying the error report (see figure 3E blocks 162 and 164: "delete errors

in the report" and comparing to a "threshold" as verifying the error report), degrading a trustworthy-measure of at least one node of the distributed network based on a result of verifying the error report (see [0009] line 17: "black listing" as degrading measure), and providing the trustworthy-measure of the at least one node to other nodes of the distributed network (see [0025] lines 9-11 and [0023] line 17; blacklisting effectively provides the trustworthy-measure to other nodes by not allowing the blacklisted to further participate).

For claim 6, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons above and further teaches the catalog includes a parameter that is based on the trustworthy-measure of each source node (see figure 3E block 164: threshold parameter).

For claim 7, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons above and further teaches the error report is based on at least one of: a modification of an original version of the downloaded file, and an abnormality associated with the downloaded file (see abstract line 17: "corrupt" as abnormality and modification).

For claim 8, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons above and further teaches verifying the error report is based upon an identifying code corresponding to an original version of the downloaded file (see figure 1: server 12 uses data in blocks 35 and 40 which are used in the verification process in figure 3E blocks 162 &164 to identify the correct object to manipulate).

For claim 9, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 8 for the reasons above and further teaches the catalog includes the identifying code (see figure 1 as the list/catalog of all pertinent information including block 35 as the identifying codes).

For claim 10, the claim essentially recites similar limitations from the combination of claims 1 and 5 therefore claim 10 is rejected under the same ground as claims 1 and 5.

For claim 11, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above and further teaches determining the validity of the report includes: receiving, from the source node, the information file and a corresponding identifying code that is based on content of the information file when the information file is introduced to the network, computing a verification code based on received content of the information file, comparing the verification code with the identifying code (see [0043] lines 6-10: different node being the source node).

For claim 12, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above and further teaches degrading a trustworthy-measure associated with the reporting node when the report is determined to be invalid (see [0025] lines 8-11 for server-client downloads, and [0020] line 9 & 13 for “noncommercial” and “token”: the error report is a non commercial token that is downloaded to the server; the method applies to all downloadable files including the non-commercial tokens, so a report-file-token would be invalidated if it is corrupt).

For claim 13, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above. The claim essentially recites additional and similar limitations from the combination of claims 5 and 6 therefore the additional limitations of claim 13 are rejected under the same ground as claims 5 and 6.

For claim 14, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above and further teaches determining the validity of the report includes notifying the source node of the report, and assessing a response from the source node to determine the validity of the report (see [0021] line 2 for “business rules” and [0025] lines 8-11 for server-client downloads and [0020] line 9 & 13 for “noncommercial” and “token”: the validation report is a non commercial token file with expectation for reply according to the business rules; a person of ordinary skill in the art would confirm that such maintenance file transfers are necessary for compliance with the business rules).

For claim 15, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 14 for the reasons above and further teaches assessing the response includes: determining that the report is valid if the response is a null-response (this rule falls under the business rules mentioned in claim 14 rejection; a person of ordinary skill in the art would confirm that a null-response reply is not sufficient to change the report-state), or an admittance of effecting the modification or corruption of the information (non-commercial token that falls under the business rules), and revising the report to identify an alternative source of the modification or corruption of the information, if the response includes an

Art Unit: 2114

acknowledgement of the modification or corruption (see figure 3C and block 138 and figure 3D block 154).

For claim 16, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 14 for the reasons above and further teaches assessing the response includes assessing the reliability of at least one of: the information file, the source node, and the reporting node (see [0009] line 17: black listing nodes mandates that all relevant nodes in the black list must be considered/assessed).

For claim 17, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above and further teaches determining the validity of the report includes determining a reliability of the source node and determining the reliability of the source node is based on at least one of: the trustworthy-measure of the source node (black list in [0009] line 17 and threshold as in figure 3E block 164), longevity of the source node within the distributed network (figure 3E block 162 is a measure of time which longevity information can be drawn from), traffic flow via the source node (see figure 3C block 138: "bandwidth" as traffic flow capability), and prior activities of the source node (errors followed by being blacklisted).

For claim 18, the claim recites similar limitations from claim 17 except that the limitations relate to the reliability of the reporting node. Yu teaches said limitations applying to all nodes (see [0009] lines 17-18 as an example for traffic flow); therefore claim 18 is rejected under the same grounds as claim 17.

For claim 19, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 10 for the reasons above and further teaches determining the validity of the report includes a verification of prior ownership of the information file (see figure 3C block 130: the list includes all owners, previous included).

For claim 20, the claim essentially recites similar limitations from claim 1 except for communication network with an administrator node. Yu teaches communication network with an administrator node (see abstract line 3) therefore claim 20 is rejected under the same grounds as claims 1.

For claims 21 and 22, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 20 for the reasons above. The claims essentially recites additional and similar limitations from claims 5 and 11 therefore the additional limitations of claims 21-22 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 5 and 11.

For claim 23, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 21 for the reasons above; the claims essentially recites additional and similar limitations from the combination of claims 17-19; therefore the additional limitations of claim 23 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 17-19.

For claim 24, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 23 for the reasons above; the claim essentially recites additional and similar limitations from the combination of claims 5-6; therefore the additional limitations of claim 24 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 5-6.

For claim 25, the claim essentially recites similar limitations from the combination of claims 5-6, and 11; therefore claim 25 is rejected under the same grounds as claims 5-6, and 11.

For claim 26, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 25 for the reasons above; the claim essentially recites additional and similar limitations from claim 11; therefore the additional limitations of claim 26 are rejected under the same grounds as claim 11.

For claim 27, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 25 for the reasons above; the claim essentially recites additional and similar limitations from the combination of claims 17-19; therefore the additional limitations of claim 27 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 17-19.

For claims 28 and 29, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 25 for the reasons above; the claims essentially recites additional and similar limitations from claims 5 and 6 respectively; therefore the additional limitations of claims 28 and 29 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 5 and 6 respectively

For claim 32, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 5 for the reasons above, and further teaches verifying the error report includes determining an originator node responsible for modifications to the downloaded file giving rise to the error report (see [0007] line 10).

Art Unit: 2114

For claims 33 and 34, Yu teaches the limitations of claim 32 for the reasons above; the claims essentially recites similar and additional limitations from claims 14 and 15 respectively; therefore the additional limitations of claims 33 and 34 are rejected under the same grounds as claims 14 and 15 respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu (US 2003/0061287 A1) in view of Ritche (US 2002/0194319 A1).

For claim 30.

- Yu teaches the limitations of claim 2 for the reasons above.
- Yu does not teach “the repeating the receiving ... source node”.
- However, Ritche teaches the repeating the receiving, computing, and comparing steps prior to transmitting the error report is used to determine whether information file errors were caused during or prior to communication of the information file from the source node (see [0067] lines 7-18 and [0009] lines 1-5).
- It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yu to include “the repeating the receiving ... source node”, as taught by Ritche, because both Yu and Ritche teach monitoring error when

delivering files in a network therefore they are analogous arts; and to avoid making the wrong conclusions about a node, when the problem originated in the link (see [0009] lines 1-5), thereby enhancing reliability.

For claim 31,

- The combination of Yu and Ritche teaches the limitations of claim 30 for the reasons above.
- Ritche further teaches preventing transmitting the error report upon determining that the information file errors were caused during communication (see [0014] lines 12-15: "appropriate job ticket" as preventing the transmission of the error report" for the "service ticket" as caused by communication).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

- Applicant essentially argues that Yu does not teach modifying trustworthy-measure of a node due to corruption of a file transfer by node because (i) "unreliability" is not related to errors, (ii) the pointed section in the reference by the examiner with regard to eliminating unreliable nodes, the unreliable nodes are the inaccessible nodes, and (iii) the elimination is performed by the client application.
- Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because (i) unreliability and inaccessibility are dissimilar; Yu does relate unreliability to errors in [0007] lines 8-11, [0008] line 4, page 3, [0023] lines 6-10 black listing, etc. (ii) inaccessibility is in step 136, before

the elimination of unreliable in step 138; (iii) claim 1 recites a method with a step of "facilitating... trustworthy-measure...", without specifying which application within the network performs said step, whether it is the client application or any other application; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

- From the applicant's arguments, examiner gathers that applicant means to say that the reduction of trustworthy measure may be gradual and occur in multiple grades of trustworthy measure (as opposed to deeming unreliable on (first) error), however it's not claimed; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YAIR LEIBOVICH whose telephone number is (571)270-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM to 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Baderman can be reached on (571)272-3644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott T Baderman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2114

Y.L.